arXiv:1606.02802v2 [math.DS] 10 Feb 2017

ITERATIVE OSCILLATION TESTS FOR DIFFERENCE EQUATIONS WITH SEVERAL NON-MONOTONE ARGUMENTS

E. BRAVERMAN[1], G. E. CHATZARAKIS, AND I. P. STAVROULAKIS

Abstract. We consider difference equations with several non-monotone deviating arguments and nonnegative coefficients. The deviations (delays and advances) are, generally, unbounded. Sufficient oscillation conditions are obtained in an explicit iterative form. Additional results in terms of lim inf are obtained for bounded deviations. Examples illustrating the oscillation tests are presented.

Keywords: difference equations, non-monotone arguments, retarded arguments, advanced arguments, bounded delays, bounded advances, oscillation.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 39A10, 39A21

1. INTRODUCTION

The paper deals with the difference equation with several variable retarded arguments of the form

$$\Delta x(n) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(n)x(\tau_i(n)) = 0, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0, \tag{E$_{\rm R}$}$$

where $\mathbb{N}_0$ is the set of nonnegative integers, and the (dual) difference equation with several variable advanced arguments of the form

$$\nabla x(n) - \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(n)x(\sigma_i(n)) = 0, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{E$_{\rm A}$}$$

Equations (E$_{\rm R}$) and (E$_{\rm A}$) are studied under the following assumptions: everywhere $(p_i(n))$, $1 \le i \le m$, are sequences of *nonnegative real numbers*, $(\tau_i(n))$, $1 \le i \le m$, are sequences of integers such that either

$$\tau_i(n) \le n-1, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0, \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} \tau_i(n) = \infty, \quad 1 \le i \le m, \tag{1.1}$$

or

$$\tau_i(n) \le n-1, \ \forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \text{ and } \exists\ M_i > 0 \text{ such that } n - \tau_i(n) \le M_i,\ 1 \le i \le m \tag{1.1$'$}$$

and $(\sigma_i(n))$, $1 \le i \le m$, are sequences of integers such that either

$$\sigma_i(n) \ge n+1, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \le i \le m, \tag{1.2}$$

or

$$\sigma_i(n) \ge n+1, \forall n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } \exists\ \mu_i > 0 \text{ such that } \sigma_i(n) - n \le \mu_i,\ 1 \le i \le m. \tag{1.2$'$}$$

Here, Δ denotes the forward difference operator $\Delta x(n) = x(n+1) - x(n)$ and ∇ corresponds to the backward difference operator $\nabla x(n) = x(n) - x(n-1)$.

Let us note that the condition $\tau_i(n) \le n-1$ ($\sigma_i(n) \ge n+1$) is not essential for lim sup-type tests; all the results of Section 2 apply to the case when $\tau_i(n) \le n$ and there is a non-delay term $\tau_j(n) = n$. However, the requirement $\lim_{n\to\infty} \tau_i(n) = \infty$ is significant, as Example 2.2 illustrates. A similar remark applies to advanced difference equation (E$_{\rm A}$).

[1]Corresponding author. E-mail maelena@math.ucalgary.ca, phone (403)-220-3956, fax (403)-282-5150

In the special case $m = 1$ equations ($\mathrm{E_R}$) and ($\mathrm{E_A}$) reduce to the equations

$$\Delta x(n) + p(n)x(\tau(n)) = 0, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \tag{1.3}$$

and

$$\nabla x(n) - p(n)x(\sigma(n)) = 0, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{1.4}$$

respectively.

Set

$$w = -\min_{\substack{n\geq 0\\ 1\leq i\leq m}} \tau_i(n).$$

Clearly, w is a finite positive integer if (1.1) holds.

By a *solution* of ($\mathrm{E_R}$), we mean a sequence of real numbers $(x(n))_{n\geq -w}$ which satisfies ($\mathrm{E_R}$) for all $n \geq 0$. It is clear that, for each choice of real numbers c_{-w}, c_{-w+1}, ..., c_{-1}, c_0, there exists a unique solution $(x(n))_{n\geq -w}$ of ($\mathrm{E_R}$) which satisfies the initial conditions $x(-w) = c_{-w}$, $x(-w+1) = c_{-w+1}$, ..., $x(-1) = c_{-1}$, $x(0) = c_0$.

By a solution of ($\mathrm{E_A}$), we mean a sequence of real numbers $(x(n))_{n\geq 0}$ which satisfies ($\mathrm{E_A}$) for all $n \geq 1$.

A solution $(x(n))_{n\geq -w}$ (or $(x(n))_{n\geq 0}$) of ($\mathrm{E_R}$) (or ($\mathrm{E_A}$)) is called *oscillatory,* if the terms $x(n)$ of the sequence are neither eventually positive nor eventually negative. Otherwise, the solution is said to be *nonoscillatory.* An equation is *oscillatory* if all its solutions oscillate.

In the last few decades, the oscillatory behavior and the existence of positive solutions of difference equations with several deviating arguments have been extensively studied, see, for example, papers [1-5,7-15] and references cited therein. More precicely, in 1999, Zhang et al. [14] studied the existence and nonexistence of positive solutions and in 1999 and 2001, Tang et al. [10,11] considered ($\mathrm{E_R}$) with constant delays, introduced some new techniques to analyze generalized characteristic equations and obtained several sharp oscillation conditions including infinite sums. In 2002, Zhang et al. [15] presented some oscillation criteria involving lim sup for ($\mathrm{E_R}$) with constant delays, while Li et al. [7] investigated only ($\mathrm{E_A}$) under the assumption that the advances are constant and established a new oscillation condition involving lim inf. In 2003, Wang [12] considered ($\mathrm{E_R}$) with constant delays and obtained some new oscillation criteria involving lim sup, while Luo et al. [8] studied a nonlinear difference equation with several constant delays and established some sufficient oscillation conditions. In 2005, Yan et al. [13] got oscillation criteria for ($\mathrm{E_R}$) with variable delays. In 2006, Berezansky et al. [1] mostly investigated non-oscillation but also obtained the following sufficient oscillation test (Theorem 5.16): If

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(n) > 0 \text{ and } \liminf_{n\to\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=\tau(n)}^{n-1} p_i(j) > \frac{1}{e},$$

where $\tau(n) = \max_{1\leq i\leq m} \tau_i(n)$, $\forall n \geq 0$, then all solutions of ($\mathrm{E_R}$) oscillate. In the recent papers [3-5], Chatzarakis et al. studied equations ($\mathrm{E_R}$) and ($\mathrm{E_A}$) and presented some oscillation conditions involving lim sup and lim inf.

However, most oscillation results presented in the previous papers, require that the arguments be monotone increasing. While this condition is satisfied by a variety of differential equations with variable delays, for difference equations, due to the discrete nature of the arguments, if retarded arguments are strictly increasing, then the deviations are eventually constant. This is one of motivations to investigate difference equations with non-monotone arguments. The challenge of this study is illustrated by the fact that, according to [2, Theorem 3], there is no constant $A > 0$

such that the inequalities

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}(n-\tau(n))p(n)>A \text{ and } \liminf_{n\to\infty}\sum_{j=\tau(n)}^{n-1}p_i(j)>A$$

guarantee oscillation of (1.3).

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 contains oscillation conditions for both retarded and advanced equations in terms of lim sup, where deviations of the argument, generally, are not assumed to be bounded. In Section 3 conditions in terms of lim inf are obtained in the case when deviations of the argument are bounded; however, a weaker result is valid for unbounded delays. Section 4 illustrates the results of the present paper with examples where oscillation could not have been established using previously known results.

2. UNBOUNDED DEVIATIONS OF ARGUMENTS AND ITERATIVE TESTS

In 2011, Braverman and Karpuz [2] and in 2014, Stavroulakis [10], established the following results for the special case of Eq. (1.3) under the assumption that the argument $\tau(n)$ is non-monotone, (1.1) holds and $\xi(n)=\max_{0\le s\le n}\tau(s)$.

Theorem 2.1 ([2, Theorem 5]). *If*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\sum_{j=\xi(n)}^{n}p(j)\prod_{i=\tau(j)}^{\xi(n)-1}\frac{1}{1-p(i)}>1, \tag{2.1}$$

then all solutions of (1.3) *oscillate.*

Theorem 2.2 ([9, Theorem 3.6]). *Assume that* $a=\liminf_{n\to\infty}\sum_{i=\tau(n)}^{n-1}p(i)$ and

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\sum_{j=\xi(n)}^{n}p(j)\prod_{i=\tau(j)}^{\xi(n)-1}\frac{1}{1-p(i)}>1-c(a), \tag{2.2}$$

where

$$c(a)=\begin{cases}\frac{1}{2}\left(1-a-\sqrt{1-2a-a^2}\right), & \text{if } 0<a\le 1/e,\\ \frac{1}{4}\left(2-3a-\sqrt{4-12a+a^2}\right), & \text{if } 0<a\le 6-4\sqrt{2} \text{ and } p(n)\ge\frac{\alpha}{2}.\end{cases}$$

Then all solutions of equation (1.3) *oscillate.*

In this section, we study oscillation of (E_R) and (E_A). We establish new sufficient oscillation conditions involving lim sup under the assumption that the arguments are non-monotone and (1.1) holds. Even for equation (1.3) with one delay, our results improve (2.1) and (2.2). The method we use is based on the iterative application of the Gronwall inequality.

2.1. **Retarded difference equations.** Let

$$\varphi_i(n)=\max_{0\le s\le n}\tau_i(s), \quad n\ge 0 \tag{2.3}$$

and

$$\varphi(n)=\max_{1\le i\le m}\varphi_i(n), \quad n\ge 0. \tag{2.4}$$

Clearly, the sequences of integers $\varphi(n)$, $\varphi_i(n)$, $1\le i\le m$ are non-decreasing and $\varphi(n)\le n-1$, $\varphi_i(n)\le n-1$, $1\le i\le m$ for all $n\ge 0$.

The following simple result is cited to explain why we can consider only the case

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(n) < 1, \quad \forall n \geq 0. \tag{2.5}$$

Theorem 2.3. *Assume that there exists a subsequence $\theta(n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ of positive integers such that*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(\theta(n)) \geq 1, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{2.6}$$

Then all solutions of $(\mathrm{E_R})$ *oscillate.*

Proof. Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that $(x(n))_{n\geq -w}$ is a nonoscillatory solution of $(\mathrm{E_R})$. Then it is either eventually positive or eventually negative. As $(-x(n))_{n\geq -w}$ is also a solution of $(\mathrm{E_R})$, we may restrict ourselves only to the case where $x(n) > 0$ for all large n. Let $n_1 \geq -w$ be an integer such that $x(n) > 0$ for all $n \geq n_1$. Then, there exists $n_2 \geq n_1$ such that $x(\tau_i(n)) > 0$, $\forall n \geq n_2$, $1 \leq i \leq m$. In view of this, Eq.$(\mathrm{E_R})$ becomes

$$\Delta x(n) = -\sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(n) x(\tau_i(n)) \leq 0, \quad \forall \theta(n) \geq n_2,$$

which means that the sequence $(x(n))$ is eventually decreasing.

Taking into account the fact that (2.6) holds, equation $(\mathrm{E_R})$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} x(\theta(n)+1) &= x(\theta(n)) - \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(\theta(n)) x(\tau_i(\theta(n))) \leq x(\theta(n)) - x(\theta(n)) \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(\theta(n)) \\ &= x(\theta(n)) \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(\theta(n))\right) \leq 0, \quad \text{for all } \theta(n) \geq n_2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\theta(n) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$, which contradicts the assumption that $x(n) > 0$ for all $n \geq n_1$. □

In a series of further computations, we try to extend the iterative result, established by Koplatadze and Kvinikadze in [6] for a differential equation with a single delay, to difference equations with several retarded arguments. The following lemma provides an estimation of a positive solution rate of decay, which is a useful tool for obtaining oscillation conditions.

Lemma 2.1. *Assume that* (2.5) *holds and $x(n)$ is a positive solution of* $(\mathrm{E_R})$. *Set*

$$a_1(n,k) := \prod_{i=k}^{n-1} \left[1 - \sum_{\ell=1}^{m} p_\ell(i)\right] \tag{2.7}$$

and

$$a_{r+1}(n,k) := \prod_{i=k}^{n-1} \left[1 - \sum_{\ell=1}^{m} p_\ell(i) a_r^{-1}(i, \tau_\ell(i))\right], \quad r \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{2.8}$$

Then

$$x(n) \leq a_r(n,k) x(k), \quad r \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{2.9}$$

Proof. Since $x(n)$ is a positive solution of $(\mathrm{E_R})$,

$$\Delta x(n) = -\sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(n) x(\tau_i(n)) \leq 0, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

which means that the sequence $(x(n))$ is decreasing.

From $(\mathrm{E_R})$ and the decreasing character of $(x(n))$, we have

$$\Delta x(n) + x(n)\sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(n) \le 0, \qquad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Applying the discrete Gronwall inequality, we obtain

$$x(n) \le x(k)\prod_{i=k}^{n-1}\left[1 - \sum_{\ell=1}^{m} p_\ell(i)\right] = a_1(n,k)x(k), \qquad \forall n \ge k \ge 0,$$

which justifies (2.9) for $r = 1$.

Assume that (2.9) holds for some $r > 1$. Substituting

$$x(\tau_\ell(n)) \ge x(n)a_r^{-1}(n, \tau_\ell(n))$$

into $(\mathrm{E_R})$ leads to the inequality

$$\Delta x(n) + \sum_{\ell=1}^{m} p_\ell(n)x(n)a_r^{-1}(n, \tau_\ell(n)) \le 0, \quad \text{for sufficiently large } n.$$

Again, applying the discrete Gronwall inequality, we obtain

$$x(n) \le x(k)\prod_{i=k}^{n-1}\left[1 - \sum_{\ell=1}^{m} p_\ell(i)a_r^{-1}(i, \tau_\ell(i))\right] = a_{r+1}(n,k)x(k),$$

due to the definition of a_{r+1} in (2.8), which concludes the induction step. The proof of the lemma is complete. □

It is interesting to see how the estimate developed in Lemma 2.1 works in the case of autonomous equations.

Example 2.1. For the equation

$$\Delta x(n) + \frac{1}{4}x(n-1) = 0,$$

inequality (2.9) for $k = n - 1$ has the form

$$x(n) \le a_r(n, n-1)x(n-1).$$

Here $a_1(n, n-1) = \frac{3}{4}$, $a_2(n, n-1) = \frac{2}{3}$, $a_3(n, n-1) = \frac{5}{8}$, $a_4(n, n-1) = \frac{3}{5}$, $a_5(n, n-1) = \frac{7}{12}$, …, $a_{2k-1} = \frac{2k+1}{4k}$, $a_{2k} = \frac{k+1}{2k+1}$, thus the best possible estimate of the rate of decrease of a nonoscillatory solution is $x(n+1) \le \frac{1}{2}x(n)$, or $x(n) \le x(0)(\frac{1}{2})^n$, which is in compliance with the fact that $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$ is the (double) root of the characteristic equation $\lambda^2 - \lambda + \frac{1}{4} = 0$.

Theorem 2.4. *Assume that* $(p_i(n))$, $1 \le i \le m$, *are sequences of nonnegative real numbers,* (1.1) *and* (2.5) *hold,* $\varphi(n)$ *is defined by* (2.4) and $a_r(n,k)$ are denoted in (2.7),(2.8). *If*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \sum_{j=\varphi(n)}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(j)a_r^{-1}(\varphi(n), \tau_i(j)) > 1, \tag{2.10}$$

then all solutions of $(\mathrm{E_R})$ *oscillate.*

Proof. Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that $(x(n))_{n\ge -w}$ is a nonoscillatory solution of $(\mathrm{E_R})$. Then it is either eventually positive or eventually negative. Similarly to the proof of Theorem 2.3, we may restrict ourselves only to the case $x(n) > 0$ for all large n. Let $n_1 \ge -w$ be an integer

such that $x(n) > 0$ for all $n \geq n_1$. By (1.1), there exists $n_2 \geq n_1$ such that $x(\tau_i(n)) > 0$, $\forall n \geq n_2$, $1 \leq i \leq m$. In view of this, Eq.($\mathrm{E_R}$) becomes

$$\Delta x(n) = -\sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(n) x(\tau_i(n)) \leq 0, \qquad \forall n \geq n_2,$$

which means that the sequence $(x(n))$ is eventually decreasing.

Summing up ($\mathrm{E_R}$) from $\varphi(n)$ to n, and using the fact that the function x is non-increasing, while the function φ (as defined by (2.4)) is non-decreasing, and taking into account that

$$\tau_i(j) \leq \varphi(n) \quad \text{and} \quad x(\tau_i(j)) \geq x(\varphi(n)) a_r^{-1}(\varphi(n), \tau_i(j)),$$

we obtain, for sufficiently large n,

$$\begin{aligned} x(\varphi(n)) &= x(n+1) + \sum_{j=\varphi(n)}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(j)\, x(\tau_i(j)) \\ &\geq \sum_{j=\varphi(n)}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(j)\, x(\tau_i(j)) \geq x(\varphi(n)) \sum_{j=\varphi(n)}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(j) a_r^{-1}(\varphi(n), \tau_i(j)). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$x(\varphi(n)) \left[1 - \sum_{j=\varphi(n)}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(j) a_r^{-1}(\varphi(n), \tau_i(j)) \right] \leq 0,$$

which gives

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \sum_{j=\varphi(n)}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(j) a_r^{-1}(\varphi(n), \tau_i(j)) \leq 1.$$

This contradicts (2.10) and the proof of the theorem is complete. □

To establish the next theorem we need the following lemma.

Lemma 2.2. (cf. [3, Lemma 2.1]). *Assume that* (1.1) *holds,* $(x(n))$ *is an eventually positive solution of* ($\mathrm{E_R}$)*, and*

$$\alpha = \min\{\alpha_i : 1 \leq i \leq m\}, \tag{2.11}$$

where

$$\alpha_i = \liminf_{n\to\infty} \sum_{j=\varphi_i(n)}^{n-1} p_i(j). \tag{2.12}$$

If $0 < \alpha \leq -1 + \sqrt{2}$, *then*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{x(n+1)}{x(\varphi(n))} \geq \frac{1 - \alpha - \sqrt{1 - 2\alpha - \alpha^2}}{2}. \tag{2.13}$$

Theorem 2.5. *Assume that* $(p_i(n))$, $1 \leq i \leq m$, *are sequences of nonnegative real numbers,* (1.1) *and* (2.5) *hold, and* $\varphi(n)$ *is defined by* (2.4). *If* $0 < \alpha \leq 1/e$, *where* α *is denoted by (2.11), and*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \sum_{j=\varphi(n)}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(j) a_r^{-1}(\varphi(n), \tau_i(j)) > 1 - \frac{1 - \alpha - \sqrt{1 - 2\alpha - \alpha^2}}{2}, \tag{2.14}$$

where $a_r(n,k)$ *is as in* (2.7), (2.8), *then all solutions of* ($\mathrm{E_R}$) *oscillate.*

Proof. Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that $(x(n))_{n\geq -w}$ is a nonoscillatory solution of $(\mathrm{E_R})$. Then, as in the proof of Theorem 2.4, for sufficiently large n, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} x(\varphi(n)) &= x(n+1) + \sum_{j=\varphi(n)}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(j)\, x(\tau_i(j)) \\ &\geq x(n+1) + x(\varphi(n)) \sum_{j=\varphi(n)}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(j) a_r^{-1}(\varphi(n), \tau_i(j)). \end{aligned}$$

that is,

$$\sum_{j=\varphi(n)}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(j) a_r^{-1}(\varphi(n), \tau_i(j)) \leq 1 - \frac{x(n+1)}{x(\varphi(n))},$$

which gives

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \sum_{j=\varphi(n)}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(j) a_r^{-1}(\varphi(n), \tau_i(j)) \leq 1 - \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{x(n+1)}{x(\varphi(n))}.$$

Assume that $0 < \alpha \leq 1/e$ (clearly, $\alpha < -1 + \sqrt{2}$) and, by Lemma 2.2, inequality (2.13) holds, and so the last inequality leads to

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \sum_{j=\varphi(n)}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(j) a_r^{-1}(\varphi(n), \tau_i(j)) \leq 1 - \frac{1 - \alpha - \sqrt{1 - 2\alpha - \alpha^2}}{2},$$

which contradicts condition (2.14).

The proof of the theorem is complete.

Remark 2.1. Observe that conditions (2.1) and (2.2) are special cases of (2.10) and (2.14) respectively, when $r = 1$.

Remark 2.2. The following example illustrates the significance of the condition $\lim_{n\to\infty} \tau_i(n) = \infty$, $1 \leq i \leq m$, in Theorems 2.4 and 2.5.

Example 2.2. Consider the retarded difference equation (1.3) with

$$p(n) = \begin{cases} 1/2, & \text{if } n = 3k, \\ 3/10, & \text{if } n \neq 3k, \end{cases} \qquad \tau(n) = \begin{cases} -1, & \text{if } n = 3k, \\ n-1, & \text{if } n \neq 3k, \end{cases} \qquad k \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Obviously (2.5) is satisfied. Also, by (2.4),

$$\varphi(n) = \max_{0\leq s\leq n} \tau(s) = \begin{cases} n-2, & \text{if } n = 3k, \\ n-1, & \text{if } n \neq 3k, \end{cases} \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

If $n = 3k$, then

$$\sum_{j=\varphi(n)}^{n} p(j) = \sum_{j=n-2}^{n} p(j) = \frac{3}{10} + \frac{3}{10} + \frac{1}{2} = \frac{11}{10}.$$

Therefore $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \sum_{j=\varphi(n)}^{n} p_i(j) \geq \frac{11}{10} > 1$, which means that (2.10) is satisfied for any r.

Also, if $n = 3k$, then

$$\sum_{j=\varphi(n)}^{n-1} p_i(j) = \sum_{j=n-2}^{n-1} p_i(j) = \frac{3}{10} + \frac{3}{10} = \frac{3}{5}$$

and, if $n \neq 3k$, then

$$\sum_{j=\varphi(n)}^{n-1} p(j) = \sum_{j=n-1}^{n-1} p(j) = \begin{cases} 1/2, & \text{if } n = 3k+1, \\ 3/10, & \text{if } n = 3k+2, \end{cases} \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Therefore

$$\alpha = \liminf_{n\to\infty} \sum_{j=\varphi(n)}^{n-1} p_i(j) = \min\left\{\frac{3}{5}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{10}\right\} = \frac{3}{10} < \frac{1}{e}$$

and

$$\sum_{j=\varphi(n)}^{n} p_i(j) = \frac{11}{10} > 1 - \frac{1-\alpha-\sqrt{1-2\alpha-\alpha^2}}{2} \simeq 0.928388218,$$

which means that (2.14) is satisfied for any r. Observe, however, that equation (1.3) has a nonoscillatory solution

$$x(-1) = -\tfrac{12}{7}, \quad x(0) = 1,\ x(1) = \frac{13}{7},\ x(2) = \frac{109}{70},$$

$$x(3) = 1,\ x(4) = \frac{13}{7},\ x(5) = \frac{109}{70},\ x(6) = 1,\ \ldots$$

which illustrates the significance of the condition $\lim_{n\to\infty} \tau(n) = \infty$ in Theorems 2.4 and 2.5.

2.2. **Advanced difference equations.** Similar oscillation theorems for the (dual) advanced difference equation ($\mathrm{E_A}$) can be derived easily. The proofs of these theorems are omitted, since they follow a similar procedure as in Subsection 2.1.

Denote

$$\rho_i(n) = \min_{s\geq n} \sigma_i(s), \quad n \geq 0 \tag{2.15}$$

and

$$\rho(n) = \min_{1\leq i\leq m} \rho_i(n), \quad n \geq 0. \tag{2.16}$$

Clearly, the sequences of integers $\rho(n)$, $\rho_i(n)$, $1 \leq i \leq m$ are non-decreasing and $\rho(n) \geq n+1$, $\rho_i(n) \geq n+1$, $1 \leq i \leq m$ for all $n \geq 0$.

Theorem 2.3′. *Assume that there exists a subsequence $\theta(n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ of positive integers such that*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(\theta(n)) \geq 1 \qquad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Then all solutions of ($\mathrm{E_A}$) *oscillate.*

Theorem 2.4′. *Assume that $(p_i(n))$, $1 \leq i \leq m$, are sequences of nonnegative real numbers,* (1.2) *and* (2.5) *hold, $\rho(n)$ is defined by* (2.16) and

$$b_1(n,k) := \prod_{i=n+1}^{k} \left[1 - \sum_{\ell=1}^{m} p_\ell(i)\right] \tag{2.17}$$

and

$$b_{r+1}(n,k) := \prod_{i=n+1}^{k} \left[1 - \sum_{\ell=1}^{m} p_\ell(i) b_r^{-1}(i, \sigma_\ell(i))\right], \qquad r \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{2.18}$$

If

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \sum_{j=n}^{\rho(n)} \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(j) b_r^{-1}(\rho(n), \sigma_i(j)) > 1, \tag{2.19}$$

then all solutions of $(\mathrm{E_A})$ *oscillate.*

Lemma 2.2′ (cf. [3, Lemma 2.1]). *Assume that* (1.2) *holds,* $(x(n))$ *is a* n *eventually positive solution of* $(\mathrm{E_R})$*, and*

$$\alpha = \min\{\alpha_i : 1 \le i \le m\}, \tag{2.20}$$

where

$$\alpha_i = \liminf_{n\to\infty} \sum_{j=n+1}^{\rho_i(n)} p_i(j). \tag{2.21}$$

If $0 < \alpha \le -1 + \sqrt{2}$*, then*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{x(n-1)}{x(\rho(n))} \ge \frac{1-\alpha-\sqrt{1-2\alpha-\alpha^2}}{2}. \tag{2.22}$$

Theorem 2.5′. *Assume that* $(p_i(n))$, $1 \le i \le m$ *are sequences of nonnegative real numbers,* (1.2) *and* (2.5) *hold,* $\rho(n)$ *is defined by* (2.16)*, and* a *is denoted by* (2.20)*. If* $0 < \alpha \le 1/e$*, and*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \sum_{j=n}^{\rho(n)} \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(j) b_r^{-1}(\rho(n), \sigma_i(j)) > 1 - \frac{1-\alpha-\sqrt{1-2\alpha-\alpha^2}}{2}, \tag{2.23}$$

where $b_r(n,k)$ *is defined in* (2.17), (2.18)*, then all solutions of* $(\mathrm{E_A})$ *oscillate.*

3. BOUNDED DEVIATIONS OF ARGUMENTS

In this section, new sufficient oscillation conditions, involving lim inf, under the assumption that all the delays (advances) are bounded and (1.1′) (or (1.2′)) holds, are established for equations $(\mathrm{E_R})$ and $(\mathrm{E_A})$. These conditions improve Theorem 5.16 in [1] and extend the following oscillation results by Chatzarakis et al. [5] to the case of non-monotone arguments.

Theorem 3.1 ([5, Theorem 2.2])**.** *Assume that the sequences* $(\tau_i(n))$, $1 \le i \le m$ *are increasing,* (1.1) *holds,*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(n) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{n\to\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=\tau_i(n)}^{n-1} p_i(j) > \frac{1}{e}. \tag{3.1}$$

Then all solutions of Eq. $(\mathrm{E_R})$ *oscillate.*

Theorem 3.2 ([5, Theorem 3.2])**.** *Assume that the sequences* $(\sigma_i(n))$, $1 \le i \le m$ *are increasing,* (1.2) *holds,*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(n) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{n\to\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=n+1}^{\sigma_i(n)} p_i(j) > \frac{1}{e}. \tag{3.2}$$

Then all solutions of Eq. $(\mathrm{E_A})$ *oscillate.*

3.1. **Retarded difference equations.** We present a new sufficient oscillation condition for $(\mathrm{E_R})$, under the assumption that all the delays are bounded and $(1.1')$ holds.

Theorem 3.3. *Assume that $(p_i(n))$, $1 \le i \le m$, are sequences of nonnegative real numbers, $(1.1')$ holds and for each $k = 1, \dots, m$,*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=\tau_k(n)}^{n-1} p_i(j) > \left(\frac{M_k}{M_k+1}\right)^{M_k+1}, \tag{3.3}$$

then all solutions of $(\mathrm{E_R})$ oscillate.

Proof. Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that $(x(n))_{n\ge -w}$ is a nonoscillatory solution of $(\mathrm{E_R})$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $x(n) > 0$ for all $n \ge n_1$. Then, there exists $n_2 \ge n_1$ such that $x(\tau_i(n)) > 0$, $\forall n \ge n_2$, $1 \le i \le m$. In view of this, Eq.$(\mathrm{E_R})$ becomes

$$\Delta x(n) = -\sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(n) x(\tau_i(n)) \le 0, \qquad \forall n \ge n_2,$$

which means that the sequence $(x(n))_{n\ge n_2}$ is non-increasing. The sequences

$$b_k(n) = \left(\frac{n-\tau_k(n)}{n-\tau_k(n)+1}\right)^{n-\tau_k(n)+1}$$

satisfy the inequality

$$\frac{1}{4} \le b_k(n) \le \left(\frac{M_k}{M_k+1}\right)^{M_k+1}, \qquad n \ge 1, \qquad 1 \le k \le m. \tag{3.4}$$

Due to (3.3), for each $k = 1, \dots, m$, we can choose $n_0(k) \ge n_2$ and $\varepsilon_k > 0$ such that for $n \ge n_0(k)$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=\tau_k(n)}^{n-1} p_i(j) > \left(\frac{M_k}{M_k+1}\right)^{M_k+1} + \varepsilon_k$$

and

$$d_k := \left(\frac{M_k}{M_k+1}\right)^{-M_k-1} \left[\left(\frac{M_k}{M_k+1}\right)^{M_k+1} + \varepsilon_k\right] > 1.$$

Denoting

$$\varepsilon_0 := \min_{1\le k\le m} \varepsilon_k > 0, \quad d := \min_{1\le k\le m} d_k > 1,$$

we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=\tau_k(n)}^{n-1} p_i(j) > \left(\frac{M_k}{M_k+1}\right)^{M_k+1} + \varepsilon_0$$

and

$$\left(\frac{M_k}{M_k+1}\right)^{-M_k-1} \left[\left(\frac{M_k}{M_k+1}\right)^{M_k+1} + \varepsilon_0\right] \ge d > 1,$$

which together with (3.3) immediately implies for any $k = 1, \dots, m$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=\tau_k(n)}^{n-1} \frac{p_i(j)}{b_k(n)} \ge \left(\frac{M_k}{M_k+1}\right)^{-M_k-1} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=\tau_k(n)}^{n-1} p_i(j) > d > 1.$$

Dividing (E_R) by $x(n)$ we have

$$\frac{x(n+1)}{x(n)} = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(n) \frac{x(\tau_i(n))}{x(n)}, \qquad n \geq n_0.$$

Multiplying and taking into account that $x(\tau_i(n))/x(n) \geq 1$, we obtain the estimate

$$\frac{x(n)}{x(\tau_k(n))} = \prod_{j=\tau_k(n)}^{n-1} \frac{x(j+1)}{x(j)} \leq \prod_{j=\tau_k(n)}^{n-1} \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(j)\right).$$

Using this estimate and the relation between the arithmetic and the geometric means, we have

$$\frac{x(n)}{x(\tau_k(n))} \leq \left[1 - \frac{1}{n-\tau_k(n)} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=\tau_k(n)}^{n-1} p_i(j)\right]^{n-\tau_k(n)}. \tag{3.5}$$

Observe that the function $f : (0,1) \to \mathbb{R}$ defined as

$$f(y) := y(1-y)^\rho, \qquad \rho \in \mathbb{N},$$

attains its maximum at $y = \frac{1}{1+\rho}$, which equals $f_{\max} = \dfrac{\rho^\rho}{(1+\rho)^{1+\rho}}$. In the inequality

$$y(1-y)^\rho \leq \frac{\rho^\rho}{(1+\rho)^{1+\rho}}, \qquad y \in (0,1), \qquad \rho \in \mathbb{N},$$

assuming $\rho = n - \tau_k(n)$, $y = x/\rho$, where $x = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=\tau_k(n)}^{n-1} p_i(j)$, we obtain from (3.5)

$$\frac{x(\tau_k(n))}{x(n)} \geq \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=\tau_k(n)}^{n-1} p_i(j) \left(\frac{n-\tau_k(n)+1}{n-\tau_k(n)}\right)^{n-\tau_k(n)+1} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=\tau_k(n)}^{n-1} \frac{p_i(j)}{b_k(n)} > d$$

for any $n \geq n_0(k)$. Denote $n_0 = \max\{n_0(1), \ldots, n_0(m)\}$. If we continue this procedure assuming $n \geq n_0 + M$, where $M = \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} M_i$, and using the properties of the geometric and the algebraic mean, we have

$$\frac{x(n)}{x(\tau_k(n))} = \prod_{j=\tau_k(n)}^{n-1} \frac{x(j+1)}{x(j)} = \prod_{j=\tau_k(n)}^{n-1} \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(j) \frac{x(\tau_i(j))}{x(j)}\right)$$

$$\leq \prod_{j=\tau_k(n)}^{n-1} \left(1 - d \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(j)\right) \leq \left[1 - \frac{d}{n-\tau_k(n)} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=\tau_k(n)}^{n-1} p_i(j)\right]^{n-\tau_k(n)}.$$

Applying the same argument, we obtain

$$\frac{x(\tau_k(n))}{x(n)} \geq d \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=\tau_k(n)}^{n-1} \frac{p_i(j)}{b_k(n)} > d^2, \quad n \geq n_0 + 2M, \ k = 1, \ldots, m,$$

$$\frac{x(\tau_k(n))}{x(n)} > d^r, \quad n \geq n_0 + rM, \quad k = 1, \ldots, m.$$

Due to (3.3), we observe that for any k

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(n) \geq \frac{1}{M_k} \left(\frac{M_k}{M_k+1}\right)^{M_k+1}.$$

Since the function $h(x) := \dfrac{1}{x}\dfrac{x^{x+1}}{(x+1)^{x+1}} = \dfrac{x^x}{(x+1)^{x+1}}$, $x \geq 1$, is decreasing and $M_k \leq M$, we conclude that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(n) \geq c := \frac{1}{M}\left(\frac{M}{M+1}\right)^{M+1} \tag{3.6}$$

and choose a subsequence $(\theta(n))$ of $\mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(\theta(n)) \geq c > 0.$$

Since

$$0 < \frac{x(n+1)}{x(n)} = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(n)\frac{x(\tau_i(n))}{x(n)}\ ,$$

we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(n)\frac{x(\tau_i(n))}{x(n)} < 1.$$

In particular,

$$\min_{1\leq k\leq m} \frac{x(\tau_k(\theta(n)))}{x(\theta(n))} \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(\theta(n)) < 1.$$

Choosing $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d^r > \frac{1}{c}$, where c was defined in (3.6), $\theta(n) \geq n_0 + rM$ and noticing that

$$d^r < \min_{1\leq k\leq m} \frac{x(\tau_k(\theta(n)))}{x(\theta(n))} \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(\theta(n))\right)^{-1} \leq \frac{1}{c}\,,$$

we obtain a contradiction, which concludes the proof. □

The following result is valid as $\left(\dfrac{n}{n+1}\right)^{n+1} < \dfrac{1}{e}$. In (3.7) a non-strict inequality is also sufficient.

Theorem 3.4. *Assume that* $(p_i(n))$, $1 \leq i \leq m$, *are sequences of nonnegative real numbers and* (1.1) *holds. If*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=\tau_k(n)}^{n-1} p_i(j) > \frac{1}{e}, \quad , k = 1, \ldots, m, \tag{3.7}$$

then all solutions of ($\mathrm{E_R}$) *oscillate.*

3.2 Advanced difference equations. Similar oscillation theorems for the (dual) advanced difference equation ($\mathrm{E_A}$) can be derived easily. The proofs of these theorems are omitted, since they follow the schemes of Subsection 3.1.

Theorem 3.3′. *Assume that* $(p_i(n))$, $1 \leq i \leq m$, *are sequences of nonnegative real numbers, all the advances are bounded,* (1.2′) *holds.*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=n+1}^{\sigma_k(n)} p_i(j) > \left(\frac{\mu_k}{\mu_k+1}\right)^{\mu_k+1}, \quad k = 1, \ldots, m, \tag{3.8}$$

then all solutions of ($\mathrm{E_A}$) *oscillate.*

Theorem 3.4′. *Assume that* $(p_i(n))$, $1 \le i \le m$, *are sequences of nonnegative real numbers, all the advances are bounded and* (1.2) *holds. If*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=n+1}^{\sigma_k(n)} p_i(j) > \frac{1}{e}, \quad k = 1, \dots, m, \tag{3.9}$$

then all solutions of ($\mathrm{E_A}$) *oscillate.*

4. EXAMPLES

In this section, we present examples illustrating the significance of our results. Observe that most of the relevant oscillation results cited in the introduction cannot be applied because they assume that the delays (advances) are constant and consequently the deviating arguments are increasing. When possible, we compare our results to the known ones, for variable deviations of the argument and non-monotone arguments.

Example 4.1. Consider the retarded difference equation

$$\Delta x(n) + px\left(\tau(n)\right) = 0, \qquad n \in \mathbb{N}_0, \tag{4.1}$$

where $p < 1$ is a constant coefficient, and

$$\tau(n) = \begin{cases} n-1 = 3k-1, & \text{if } n = 3k \\ n-2 = 3k-1, & \text{if } n = 3k+1 \\ n-4 = 3k-2, & \text{if } n = 3k+2 \end{cases}, \qquad k \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Obviously (1.1) and (2.5) are satisfied. Also, by (2.4) we have

$$\varphi(n) = \max_{0\le s\le n} \tau(s) = \begin{cases} n-1 = 3k-1, & \text{if } n = 3k \\ n-2 = 3k-1, & \text{if } n = 3k+1 \\ n-3 = 3k-1, & \text{if } n = 3k+2 \end{cases}, \qquad k \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

If $n = 3k$, then $\varphi(n) = n-1 = \tau(n)$ and, in view of (2.7), the left-hand side in (2.10) is

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=\varphi(n)}^{n} p(j) a_3^{-1}(\varphi(n), \tau(j)) &= \sum_{j=n-1}^{n} p(j) a_3^{-1}(n-1, \tau(j)) \\ &= p\frac{1}{a_3(n-1, \tau(n-1))} + p\frac{1}{a_3(n-1, \tau(n))} \\ &= p\frac{1}{a_3(n-1, n-5)} + p\frac{1}{a_3(n-1, n-1)} \\ &= p\frac{1}{\prod_{i=n-5}^{n-2} \left(1 - p\frac{1}{a_2(i, \tau(i))}\right)} + p, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\prod_{i=n-5}^{n-2}\left(1-p\frac{1}{a_2(i,\tau(i))}\right)=\left(1-p\frac{1}{a_2(n-5,\tau(n-5))}\right)\left(1-p\frac{1}{a_2(n-4,\tau(n-4))}\right)\times$$
$$\times\left(1-p\frac{1}{a_2(n-3,\tau(n-3))}\right)\left(1-p\frac{1}{a_2(n-2,\tau(n-2))}\right)$$
$$=\left(1-\frac{p}{a_2(n-5,n-7)}\right)\left(1-\frac{p}{a_2(n-4,n-8)}\right)\left(1-\frac{p}{a_2(n-3,n-4)}\right)\left(1-\frac{p}{a_2(n-2,n-4)}\right)$$
$$=\left(1-\frac{p}{a_2(n-5,n-7)}\right)\left(1-\frac{p}{a_2(n-4,n-8)}\right)\left(1-\frac{p}{a_2(n-3,n-4)}\right)\left(1-\frac{p}{a_2(n-2,n-4)}\right)$$
$$=\left(1-\frac{p}{\left(1-\frac{p}{1-\frac{p}{(1-p)^4}}\right)\left(1-\frac{p}{1-\frac{p}{1-p}}\right)}\right)^2\left(1-\frac{p}{1-\frac{p}{1-\frac{p}{(1-p)^4}}}\right)\times$$
$$\times\left(1-\frac{p}{\left(1-\frac{p}{1-\frac{p}{(1-p)^2}}\right)^2\left(1-\frac{p}{1-\frac{p}{(1-p)^4}}\right)\left(1-\frac{p}{1-\frac{p}{1-p}}\right)}\right)$$

Therefore

$$\sum_{j=\varphi(n)}^{n}p(j)a_3^{-1}(\varphi(n),\tau(j))=p+$$
$$+\frac{p}{\left(1-\frac{p}{\left(1-\frac{p}{1-\frac{p}{(1-p)^4}}\right)\left(1-\frac{p}{1-\frac{p}{1-p}}\right)}\right)^2\left(1-\frac{p}{\left(1-\frac{p}{1-\frac{p}{(1-p)^2}}\right)^2\left(1-\frac{p}{1-\frac{p}{(1-p)^4}}\right)\left(1-\frac{p}{1-\frac{p}{1-p}}\right)}\right)\left(1-\frac{p}{1-\frac{p}{1-\frac{p}{(1-p)^4}}}\right)}.$$

The computation immediately implies that, if $p\in(0.174816,0.183)$ then

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\sum_{j=\varphi(n)}^{n}p(j)a_3^{-1}(\varphi(n),\tau(j))>1.$$

For example, for $p=0.175$ inequality (2.10) holds for $r=3$, which means that all solutions of (4.1) oscillate. Nevertheless, for $p\in(0.1741,0.183)$ condition (2.14) is satisfied for $r=3$, since

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\sum_{j=\varphi(n)}^{n}p(j)a_3^{-1}(\varphi(n),\tau(j))>1-\frac{1}{2}\left(1-p-\sqrt{1-2p-p^2}\right).$$

Observe, however, that

$$a=\liminf_{n\to\infty}\sum_{i=\tau(n)}^{n-1}p(i)=\liminf_{n\to\infty}\sum_{i=n-1}^{n-1}p(i)=p$$

and

$$c(a)=\frac{1}{2}\left(1-a-\sqrt{1-2a-a^2}\right)=\frac{1}{2}\left(1-p-\sqrt{1-2p-p^2}\right).$$

Also,

$$\sum_{j=\varphi(n)}^{n} p(j) \prod_{i=\tau(j)}^{\varphi(n)-1} \frac{1}{1-p(i)} = \begin{cases} p\frac{1}{(1-p)^4} + p, & \text{if } n = 3k \\ p\frac{1}{(1-p)^4} + 2p, & \text{if } n = 3k+1 \\ p\frac{1}{(1-p)^4} + 2p + p\frac{1}{1-p}, & \text{if } n = 3k+2 \end{cases}, \ k \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Thus

$$\max\left\{p\frac{1}{(1-p)^4} + p, p\frac{1}{(1-p)^4} + 2p, p\frac{1}{(1-p)^4} + 2p + p\frac{1}{1-p}\right\} = p\frac{1}{(1-p)^4} + 2p + p\frac{1}{1-p}.$$

If $p < 0.1829$, the computation immediately implies that

$$p\frac{1}{(1-p)^4} + 2p + p\frac{1}{1-p} \leq 1$$

and, if $p < 0.1801$, then

$$p\frac{1}{(1-p)^4} + 2p + p\frac{1}{1-p} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - p - \sqrt{1-2p-p^2}\right).$$

Therefore, if $p \in (0.174816, 0.1801)$, the conditions (2.1) and (2.2) are not satisfied.

Moreover, observe that if $p \in (0.1741, 0.174816)$, condition (2.14) holds for $r = 3$ while (2.10) and also (2.1) and (2.2) are not satisfied. For example, for $p = 0.1742$ only (2.14) holds for $r = 3$.

At this point we should remark that in condition (2.14) an extra requirement is needed: $0 < \alpha \leq 1/e$. Thus, when $\alpha \to 0$ (2.14) coincides with (2.10).

Example 4.2. Consider the delay difference equation

$$\Delta x(n) + \frac{1}{8}x\left(\tau_1(n)\right) + \frac{1}{12}x\left(\tau_2(n)\right) = 0, \quad n \geq 0, \tag{4.2}$$

with

$$\tau_1(n) = \begin{cases} n-3 & \text{if } n \text{ is even} \\ n-1 & \text{if } n \text{ is odd} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_2(n) = \begin{cases} n-4 & \text{if } n \text{ is even} \\ n-1 & \text{if } n \text{ is odd} \end{cases}.$$

Here, it is clear that (1.1) and (2.5) are satisfied. Also, by (2.3) and (2.4) we have

$$\varphi_1(n) = \varphi_2(n) = \begin{cases} n-2 & \text{if } n \text{ is even} \\ n-1 & \text{if } n \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\varphi(n) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq 2} \varphi_i(n) = \begin{cases} n-2 & \text{if } n \text{ is even} \\ n-1 & \text{if } n \text{ is odd} \end{cases}.$$

If n is even, then $\varphi(n) = n-2$, $\tau_1(n) = n-3$, $\tau_2(n) = n-4$ and, in view of (2.7), (2.10) gives

$$\sum_{j=\varphi(n)}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(j) a_1^{-1}(\varphi(n), \tau_i(j)) = \sum_{j=n-2}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{2} p_i(j) a_1^{-1}(n-2, \tau_i(j))$$

$$= \frac{1}{8} \cdot \left[\frac{1}{\left(1-\frac{5}{24}\right)^3} + 1 + \frac{1}{1-\frac{5}{24}}\right] + \frac{1}{12} \cdot \left[\frac{1}{\left(1-\frac{5}{24}\right)^4} + 1 + \frac{1}{\left(1-\frac{5}{24}\right)^2}\right] \simeq 0.963276895.$$

Also

$$\sum_{j=\varphi(n)}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i(j) a_2^{-1}(\varphi(n), \tau_i(j)) = \sum_{j=n-2}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{2} p_i(j) a_2^{-1}(n-2, \tau_i(j))$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
= & \frac{1/8}{\left[1-\frac{1}{8}\cdot\frac{1}{1-\frac{5}{24}}-\frac{1}{12}\cdot\frac{1}{1-\frac{5}{24}}\right]^2\left[1-\frac{1}{8}\cdot\frac{1}{\left(1-\frac{5}{24}\right)^3}-\frac{1}{12}\cdot\frac{1}{\left(1-\frac{5}{24}\right)^4}\right]} \\
& +\frac{1/12}{\left[1-\frac{1}{8}\cdot\frac{1}{\left(1-\frac{5}{24}\right)^3}-\frac{1}{12}\cdot\frac{1}{\left(1-\frac{5}{24}\right)^4}\right]^2\left[1-\frac{1}{8}\cdot\frac{1}{1-\frac{5}{24}}-\frac{1}{12}\cdot\frac{1}{1-\frac{5}{24}}\right]^2} \\
& +\frac{1}{8}+\frac{1}{12}+\frac{1/8}{\left[1-\frac{1}{8}\cdot\frac{1}{1-\frac{5}{24}}-\frac{1}{12}\cdot\frac{1}{1-\frac{5}{24}}\right]} \\
& +\frac{1/12}{\left[1-\frac{1}{8}\cdot\frac{1}{\left(1-\frac{5}{24}\right)^3}-\frac{1}{12}\cdot\frac{1}{\left(1-\frac{5}{24}\right)^4}\right]\left[1-\frac{1}{8}\cdot\frac{1}{1-\frac{5}{24}}-\frac{1}{12}\cdot\frac{1}{1-\frac{5}{24}}\right]}
\end{aligned}
$$

i.e.,

$$\sum_{j=\varphi(n)}^{n}\sum_{i=1}^{m}p_i(j)a_2^{-1}(\varphi(n),\tau_i(j))\simeq 1.553022949$$

Therefore

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\sum_{j=\varphi(n)}^{n}\sum_{i=1}^{m}p_i(j)a_2^{-1}(\varphi(n),\tau_i(j))\geq 1.553022949>1,$$

that is, condition (2.10) of Theorem 2.4 is satisfied and therefore all solutions of (4.2) oscillate. Also,

$$a_1=\liminf_{n\to\infty}\sum_{i=\varphi_1(n)}^{n-1}p_1(i)=\frac{1}{8}\qquad\text{and}\qquad a_2=\liminf_{n\to\infty}\sum_{i=\varphi_2(n)}^{n-1}p_2(i)=\frac{1}{12}$$

and therefore

$$\alpha=\min\{\alpha_i:1\leq i\leq 2\}=\frac{1}{12}.$$

Hence

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\sum_{j=\varphi(n)}^{n}\sum_{i=1}^{m}p_i(j)a_2^{-1}(\varphi(n),\tau_i(j))>1-\frac{1}{2}\left(1-a-\sqrt{1-2a-a^2}\right)\simeq 0.996196338,$$

that is, condition (2.14) of Theorem 2.5 is also satisfied.

Here, it is obvious that

$$n-\tau_1(n)\leq 3=M_1\qquad\text{and}\qquad n-\tau_2(n)\leq 4=M_2$$

and therefore

$$M=\max_{1\leq i\leq 2}M_i=4.$$

Observe that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\sum_{i=1}^{2}\sum_{j=\tau_i(n)}^{n-1}p_i(j)=\frac{1}{8}+\frac{1}{12}=\frac{5}{24}<\left(\frac{M}{M+1}\right)^{M+1}=0.32768.$$

That is, condition (3.3) is not satisfied. Also the second condition in (3.1) is not satisfied.

Fig. 1 below illustrates a couple of solutions of (4.2). As can be observed, both solutions are oscillatory.



Figure 1: Two solutions of (4.2) for (left) $-4 \leq n \leq 100$, (middle) $30 \leq n \leq 65$, (right) $60 \leq n \leq 90$. Both solutions are oscillatory.

Example 4.3. Consider the delay difference equation

$$\Delta x(n) + a(n)x\left(\tau_1(n)\right) + \frac{1}{125}x\left(\tau_2(n)\right) = 0, \qquad n \geq 0, \tag{4.3}$$

with

$$\tau_1(n) = \begin{cases} n-1 & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \\ n-2 & \text{if } n \text{ is odd,} \end{cases} \qquad \tau_2(n) = \begin{cases} n-2 & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \\ n-3 & \text{if } n \text{ is odd,} \end{cases}$$

$$a(n) = \begin{cases} \frac{3}{125} & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \\ \\ \frac{37}{125} & \text{if } n \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

Evidently

$$n - \tau_1(n) \leq 2 = M_1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad n - \tau_2(n) \leq 3 = M_2$$

and therefore for $k = 1$

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{2} \sum_{j=\tau_1(n)}^{n-1} p_i(j) = \frac{37}{125} + \frac{1}{125} = \frac{38}{125} = 0.304 > \left(\frac{M_1}{M_1+1}\right)^{M_1+1} \approx 0.2962963,$$

while for $k = 2$

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{2} \sum_{j=\tau_2(n)}^{n-1} p_i(j) = \frac{37}{125} + \frac{3}{125} + \frac{2}{125} = 0.336 > \left(\frac{M_2}{M_2+1}\right)^{M_2+1} \approx 0.31640625,$$

that is, condition (3.3) is satisfied and, by Theorem 3.3, all solutions of Eq.(4.3) oscillate.

Acknowledgments

The first author was partially supported by NSERC, grants RGPIN/261351-2010 and RGPIN-2015-05976.

References

[1] L. Berezansky and E. Braverman, On existence of positive solutions for linear difference equations with several delays, *Advances Dyn. Syst. Appl.,* **1** (2006), 29–47.

[2] E. Braverman and B. Karpuz, On oscillation of differential and difference equations with non-monotone delays, *Appl. Math. Comput.,* **218** (2011), 3880–3887.

[3] G. E. Chatzarakis, T. Kusano and I. P. Stavroulakis, Oscillation conditions for difference equations with several variable arguments, *Mathematica Bohemica* (in press).

[4] G. E. Chatzarakis, J. Manojlovic, S. Pinelas and I. P. Stavroulakis, Oscillation criteria of difference equations with several deviating arguments, *Yokohama Math. J.,* **60** (2014), 13–31.

[5] G. E. Chatzarakis, S. Pinelas and I. P. Stavroulakis, Oscillations of difference equations with several deviated arguments, *Aequationes. Math.,* **88** (2014), 105–123.
[6] R.G. Koplatadze and G. Kvinikadze, On the oscillation of solutions of first order delay differential inequalities and equations, *Georgian Math. J.,* **3** (1994), 675–685.
[7] X. Li and D. Zhu, Oscillation of advanced difference equations with variable coefficients, *Ann. Differential Equations,* **18** (2002), 254–263.
[8] X. N. Luo, Y. Zhou and C. F. Li, Oscillations of a nonlinear difference equation with several delays, *Mathematica Bohemica,* **128** (2003), 309–317.
[9] I. P. Stavroulakis, Oscillation criteria for delay and difference equations with non-monotone arguments, *Appl. Math. Comput.,* **226** (2014), 661–672.
[10] X. H. Tang and J. S. Yu, Oscillation of delay difference equations, *Comput. Math. Appl.,* **37** (1999), 11–20.
[11] X. H. Tang and R. Y. Zhang, New oscillation criteria for delay difference equations, *Comput. Math. Appl.,* **42** (2001), 1319–1330.
[12] X. Wang, Oscillation of delay difference equations with several delays, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **286** (2003), 664–674.
[13] W. Yan, Q. Meng and J. Yan, Oscillation criteria for difference equation of variable delays, *DCDIS Proceedings* **3** (2005), 641–647.
[14] B. G. Zhang and C. J. Tian, Nonexistence and existence of positive solutions for difference equations with unbounded delay, *Comput. Math. Appl.,* **36** (1998), 1–8.
[15] B. G. Zhang and Y. Zhou, Oscillations of difference equations with several delays, *Comput. Math. Appl.,* **44** (2002), 817–821.

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Calgary, 2500 University Drive N. W., Calgary, Canada AB T2N 1N4
E-mail address: maelena@math.ucalgary.ca

Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering Educators, School of Pedagogical and Technological Education (ASPETE), 14121, N. Heraklio, Athens, Greece
E-mail address: geaxatz@otenet.gr, gea.xatz@aspete.gr

Department of Mathematics, University of Ioannina, 451 10 Ioannina, Greece
E-mail address: ipstav@cc.uoi.gr